



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

trine of 'open covenants, openly arrived at,' was supplanted by the policy of 'secret agreements, secretly arrived at,' the public had a right to believe, and did believe, that the fundamental principles of the league would be in accordance with these well-known and long-advocated policies."

By beginning in the natural way; namely, by the instrument of an international lawmaking body, all the difficulties now paralyzing reason would largely disappear. The details of organization, the selection of officers, the adjustment of finances, questions of exclusion and control; all elements involving personal equation; questions of representation, reduction of armaments, codes, guarantees, tariff control, waterways, neutrality, and the infinite number of others, would be settled in accordance with the principles of law and equity; and such laws, being the product of voluntary and co-operative beings, could through the years gradually reveal the ways to accomplish what now seems to be the impossible. Such a method of procedure could threaten in no sense the world as would any alliance for the enforcement of peace. It would be in conformity with the well-known principle that compulsory arbitration, compulsion and conciliation, are mutually exclusive terms and self-contradictory in nature. Presenting no fears, even of economic pressure, it would generate no dangerous hostilities, but would be a continuation of that very significant and familiar accomplishment most conspicuously set forth in that most illuminating "Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes" adopted at The Hague and ratified by the nations in 1899. As said by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, speaking with reference to the Adamson Law at Green Bay, Wisconsin, September 20, 1916: "All we have to do is to stand firmly for principle, and we can get justice done."

LET US MAKE SURE NOW

THE DAVY CROCKETT strain in us demands that before we go ahead we be sure we are right. To those who argue that we can safely accept the Covenant of the League of Nations, bad as it is agreed to be, because after we have signed it we can then proceed to patch it up, we would offer a word of warning. We would remind them of a single stubborn fact. That fact is this: When the United States signs the instrument she signs a treaty and assumes under it all treaty obligations. This means that she assumes every possible obligation, moral and legal, to abide by the terms of the treaty. When President Wilson or any one else advises us that when we have signed the treaty we have assumed no legal, but simply a moral, obligation, he renders a disservice to our thinking, an insult, indeed, to the moral intelligence of every right-minded American. The

second clause of article 6 of the United States Constitution provides that all treaties under the authority of the United States are the "supreme law of the land"; that, further, "the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." If, by signing the treaty, we become parties to this League of Nations, it becomes our moral and our legal obligation to do everything in our power to comply with the recommendations of the Council. In concrete terms that simply means that if the Council recommends that the United States shall send its armies to Abyssinia, we shall be legally and morally bound to do just that thing. A group of nine men dominated by five will have legislative, judicial, and executive power to decide whether or not the United States shall do that thing. It is conceivable that a situation might arise where the United States ought to send an army to Abyssinia; and if we, the American people, should feel that it was our duty to do that, we would do it; but that decision should be made, in our judgment, by the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the United States, and not by any group of five men sitting in Geneva or elsewhere. Davy Crockett's words were, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead." That has the American ring about it. Before we become a part of this alliance to enforce peace, let us first make sure of all that it means, for once the American people are convinced that a given course is right, they may be trusted to go ahead. They did it in the World War. They would do it again. But they knew where they were going then.

ENGLISH POETS AND THE WAR

DURING THE WAR there were poets who defended it, stimulated enlistment in it, and prophesied great things from it. Since it closed, the current of comment by the singers has been quite adverse. Their mood, especially those of them who actually fought in Europe, is one of "pacifism," of contempt for the bellicose arm-chair ranters for war who stayed at home, and a terrible realism in depicting their own and other soldiers' experiences.

"You hope that we shall tell you that they found their happiness in fighting,
Or that they died with a song on their lips,
Or that we shall use the old familiar phrases
With which your paid servants please you in the press;
But we are poets
And shall tell the truth."

Thus speaks Osbert Sitwell in "Argonaut and Jugger-naut."

Even more poignantly rebellious is Siegfried Sassoon,

who began his caustic criticism before the war closed, and who keeps it up in his latest volume. Likewise in Robert Nichols' verse you get the same affirmation of the hideousness and futility of the process.

The significance of this revolt is that it comes from youth, and they are men of a social caste that hitherto has glorified almost all the wars in which Great Britain has shared. But no longer do these men speak the "Rule Britannia" dialect.

"HUMANIZING" AN ARMY

SECRETARY OF WAR BAKER on February 26th issued a statement, or "order," through the General Staff office, with which officers were charged to "familiarize themselves at once." Technically considered, it is a memorandum on the "treatment of recruits," who, by the way, are not forthcoming now in a way to please the War Department.

Following is the text of the order:

"The treatment of the new soldier must be based on the human element much more than has been the case in the past. We have given our pledge that the new army shall be a really democratic institution, not a thing apart from the people, but essentially a part of the people, by and for whom it exists, and it is incumbent upon every officer and non-commissioned officer of the service to do his utmost to bring this about, not only in drill and discipline, but also in human interest and sympathy for the thoughts and feelings of the young civilian who dons our uniform."

The inferential admissions of this document as to past practices are significant. We shall not attempt to say precisely how much its issuance is due to the widespread revolt of non-professional officers and drafted privates, who served in the A. E. F., against the temper and the tactics of the West Point "regulars" under whom they acted at home and abroad—a revolt that smouldered in days of war, but has flamed up and out since the armistice. That this fierce resentment against the "caste" system of the regular army and the "machine" conception of the private, which the West Pointer has come to hold through long years of unchallenged power, has had much to do with the present demand for "humanization," we have little doubt. Even a General Staff knows when to pay at least mock obeisance to democracy and humanity.

We are interested in another phrase in this order. It is the one in which Secretary Baker says that the country has given a pledge that the army shall be a "democratic institution." We can understand how an army can begin to form and function in a manner approximating democratic rule; but that it can stay so, or function efficiently from the military standpoint, while so managed, we

doubt. Soviet Russia has tried it and swiftly seen a most autocratic form of army rule come to pass to meet alleged or real national needs.

Militarism and autocracy are Siamese twins. However, we have no objection to an effort to humanize the autocratic ideal so far as it may be done; but we do not expect to see colonels and privates fraternizing, or army-post administration decided by a referendum of officers and privates, or court-martial justice rival in equity that decreed by civilian courts. Lead is still lead and gold is still gold, despite the latest proof that they have unsuspected affinities and are neither of them matter, but only differing modes of motion. An army barrack is not a home and never can be made one; and a system that has for its corner-stone unquestioning, unreasoning obedience cannot be expected to function like a free State.

HOPEFUL WORDS FROM JAPAN

THE JAPANESE correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* strikes a reassuring chord from out of what has sounded to us as an inharmonious orchestra in Japan. He tells us that Premier Hara is showing considerable determination in his efforts to get the government of Japan out of the control of the army. We are given a picture of the popular agitation against the old iron-fisted soldier faction which has tried to make a second Germany out of Japan. He expresses the view that Japan "is rapidly joining with the rest of the world in its hatred and contempt of anything which savors of Prussianism."

It appears that Ichizo Hattori, formerly governor of Hyogo prefecture and now a member of the Diet, has recently made a strong attack in open session on the militarists, accusing the war office of constantly interfering in secret with Japan's foreign relations, and that to the serious detriment of the reputation of Japan abroad. It is true that the war minister denied these charges; but we are convinced by what this correspondent says, and by certain other facts which have reached us, that there is a growing tendency on the part of the Japanese public to disagree with the views of the war minister. Some of the newspapers, such as the *Yomiura*, are discussing the whole matter with unusual frankness, speaking in concrete terms about such things as Japanese diplomacy in China and the unscrupulous activities of militarists, especially also in China.

Mr. Osaki, having recently returned to Japan after an extended journey through America and Europe, has spoken very critically of Japan, accusing her of being a "Fuji standing upside down." Among other things Mr. Osaki said: